

Board of Adjustment

Minutes

City Council Chambers, Lower Level
October 1, 2014

Board Members Present:

Trent Montague – Chair
Mark Freeman
Tyler Stradling
Tony Siebers

Board Members Absent:

Greg Hitchens (excused)
Wade Swanson (excused)

Staff Present:

Gordon Sheffield
Angelica Guevara
Tom Ellsworth
Margaret Robertson
Wahid Alam
Kim Steadman
Kaelee Wilson
Mike Gildenstern

Others Present:

Jason Sanks
Josh Sohn
Amanda Sohn
Richard Dyer
Randy Downing
Alan Tom

The study session began at 4:47 p.m. The Public Hearing meeting began at 5:30 p.m. Before adjournment at 6:26 p.m., the following items were considered and recorded.

Study Session began at 4:47 p.m.

- A. Zoning Administrator's Report
 - 1. Discuss modifying the Zoning Ordinance to allow public banners in the public right of way, as Mesa Community College is proposing to celebrate the 50th Anniversary of the school by installing banners along the street frontage. Currently, the Zoning Ordinance only allows banners Downtown.
 - 2. Discuss Sign Code Update Draft that was sent out for public comment, providing revisions for some allowances for ground and attached signs.
- B. The items scheduled for the Board's Public Hearing were discussed.

Study Session adjourned at 5:15 p.m.

Public Hearing began at 5:30 p.m.

- A. Consider Minutes from the September 3, 2014 Meeting a motion was made by Boardmember Freeman and seconded by Boardmember Siebers to approve the minutes. Vote: Passed 4-0 (Excused- Boardmembers Hitchens and Swanson)
- B. Consent Agenda a motion to approve the consent agenda as read was made by Boardmember Siebers and seconded by Boardmember Stradling. Vote: Passed 4-0 (Excused-Boardmembers Hitchens and Swanson)

**Board of Adjustment Meeting
October 1, 2014**

Case No.: BA14-048

Location: 1954 East Huber Street

Subject: Requesting a Variance to allow a garage to encroach into the required side setback in the RS-9 zoning district. (PLN2014-00399)

Decision: Denied

Summary: The applicant, Josh Sohn of 1954 East Huber Street presented his case to the Board. Mr. Sohn stated that he believes that the neighborhood has many forward-facing garages, some of which protrude beyond the livable space. He went on to explain that since his house is setback 55' feet, while setbacks in most of development are at 25'-30', he has an irregular situation and a garage addition would be appropriate to the site. He then presented letters of support from neighbors to the Board.

Mr. Sohn explained to Chair Montague and the Board that his letters of support are from a Gregory Porter, who lives a street north of the site, and his neighbor at 1932 E. Grandview Street, who is just southwest of his house.

The applicant informed Boardmember Freeman that he wanted the garage to come out in front of the house, instead of in the rear, because a garage would be useless in the backyard and would interfere with his small children playing. He said that he drew up plans himself, before a professional checked them off, and was told by the professional that since his house sits on an irregular lot, there may be a chance for a variance approval.

The applicant confirmed for Boardmember Stradling and Freeman that his proposed garage would protrude 24' in front of the existing livable space and that the setback on west side is 55' , and after coming forward 24', it would and would leave 31' of setback. He explained that he had talked to his next door neighbors, and they were supportive, but didn't think that it was necessary to get signatures, or have them come to speak on his behalf.

Mr. Sohn informed Boardmember Siebers that the opposition letter from 1918 E. Huber is located four houses down from his property, and the gentleman who wrote the letter does not currently live there, he serves only as the power-of-attorney.

Boardmember Stradling explained to the applicant that for him to try to find a way to support it, he applies the case to the variance standards to allow for deviations. Although the lot may be irregular, he didn't see it as something that would deprive the applicant of a privilege that others in the neighborhood would enjoy. He went on to say that an older custom community will foster a variety of housing styles, but to deviate so significantly, would grant a special privilege to the applicant.

Mr. Sohn explained that he is a car enthusiast, and that he would rather work on projects inside instead of outside, to screen his vehicles from public view, otherwise the automobiles will be a disservice to the neighborhood.

Board of Adjustment Meeting October 1, 2014

Staff member Alam explained to Boardmember Freeman that there is still a 25' setback, even with the addition of a new garage. Even with adding an additional 1700'-1800' square feet of car space, the lot coverage would be around 37%, staying within the 45% allowed in the district. Mr. Alam maintained that the Ordinance requires that a garage must be at least 3 ft behind living space. He explained that most houses in the area have a side entry garage, so when the garage protrudes 24' in front of the livable space, it detracts from the neighborhood character. He added that those who constructed additional garages in the area, built them detached and set them back in the rear. He added that the applicant doesn't need a variance to build, just a permit, as long as they are 3 feet behind the livable area.

Boardmember Siebers concluded that the applicant's backyard was comparable to other backyards in the neighborhood, so he couldn't see a disadvantage wrought from an irregular yard if the applicant chose to build his garage in the rear of the house.

Chair Montague viewed the proposed garage as a huge deviation, so he would not be able to support the Variance request.

Motion: It was moved by Boardmember Stradling seconded by Boardmember Freeman to deny case BA14-048.

FINDINGS:

1. The applicant is proposing to build additional garage spaces in front of the house. The existing house has approximately 40 feet front setback, where as the proposed garage will have only 24 feet setback making it closer to the street than the primary wall of the house.
2. The existing house setback along Gilbert Road, east property line is only 6'-6" when 10 feet is required. Also there is a 10 feet P.U.E along east property line/R.O.W.
3. The existing house encroaches 3' 6" into the required side yard and P.U.E.
4. The existing 6' tall screen wall along Gilbert encroaches into the R.O.W.
5. The original house was constructed in 1977. Historical aerials indicate the screen wall may have been installed some time after 2011.
6. The interior side yard along the west property line is 7' (7 feet required), where the setback along the east property line is 6'-6" (10 feet required). The front setback of existing house is approximately 42 feet (25 feet required). The rear setback of the existing house is 25 feet (25 feet required).
7. The strict application of the Zoning Ordinance will not deprive the property owner of privileges enjoyed by other properties within the same subdivision of the same zoning district to build approximately additional garage space half the size of the existing house, since there are options/ alternative to build additional garage space per current zoning code.

Vote: Denied (4-0) (Excused-Boardmembers Hitchens and Swanson)

**Board of Adjustment Meeting
October 1, 2014**

Case No.: BA14-049

Location: 5765 East McKellips Road

Subject: Requesting a Special Use Permit to allow a wireless communications facility to exceed the maximum height allowed in the LC zoning district. (PLN2014-00395)

Decision: Approved with Conditions

Summary: The applicant Jason Sanks represented Shaw and Associates, on behalf of Verizon wireless 6501 E. Greenway Parkway Suite #103 Scottsdale, AZ 85254. He thanked staff for working with them, and acknowledged that both sides came to agreement on everything except one condition. He explained to the Board that he was asking for leniency for the required height of requested palms to help screen the stealth monopalm tower on the site. He informed the Board, that according to his expert, a 35' tall tree has a 50% chance of surviving, but when limited to 25', the tree generally has a better chance of survival. He concluded that staff worked away from Date Palm to a Mexican fan palm so the trees would be faster growing.

Staff member Ellsworth invited the Board to turn the printout of appendix A page 4, Chapter 35 addressing Antennas and Wireless Communications Facilities in the Ordinance. He explained that when determining the context of the site, staff can propose additional landscaping such as secondary planting of trees similar in appearance to the stealth design of the telecommunication facility, and it may be a condition as part of the approval to mitigate the visual impact of the facility. He alluded to the space between buildings above the canopy where the 55' monopalm would go, citing that it would be 20' above the tree canopy, so the monopalm would protrude an additional 35' above the trees. He stated that the original condition of approval was for two 35' palms but staff was willing to go down to two trees at 25' and 35', to blend and reduce visual impact.

Staff member Ellsworth explained to the Board that if a 35' tree is approved, and then dies, it would be the applicant's obligation to replace the dead tree. Mr. Ellsworth also added that although he didn't have exact numbers for palm tree viability, but that this is a condition, pulled from previous cases, where there are stipulations requiring 35' trees in other locations. Mr. Ellsworth finished in saying that Staff is agreeable to one tree at 25' and one at 35'

Boardmember Freeman cited Riverview Park, and although he was not sure about the species of palm trees or the survivability, mentioned that the trees are still there, seemingly thriving, and they may be 60'-70' in height.

Mr. Sanks explained to the Board that if they approve one palm at 25' and one at 35', his client had advised appeal. He went on to point to the monopalm just adjacent to the site across June street, with no additional palm trees to screen it, adding that there are many palms in the area, but just not on the parcel in question. He closed with saying that of the 150 cell tower sites that he and his partner are working on around The Valley, only 2 have required a planting of additional palms

Board of Adjustment Meeting October 1, 2014

Zoning Administrator Sheffield advised Chairman Montague to take a vote, as it is Staff's preference to include one palm at 25' and one at 35' to screen and blend the proposed monopalm, and if applicant chooses to appeal on what Staff feels is a relatively minor condition, then let the appeal be presented.

Mr. Sanks said that he is concerned with a potential ongoing precedent to require two mature trees when cell tower sites are developed. He explained that to purchase and install 2 mature date palms, the cost is \$50,000, and it would nearly increase the cost of the site by 50%. Outside of general livability and cost concerns, both trees would need to be planted on the parcel outside Verizon's lease area, so then there would be an issue on how to come to terms for maintenance in perpetuity. Mr. Sanks pointed out, that in addition, at some point the height becomes problematic for monopalm functionality as well.

Zoning Administrator Sheffield clarified for Chairman Montague that it comes down to if the Board feels if the applicant is justified in making the change to the particular condition that requires 25' and 35' palm trees in the Conditions of Approval, then the motion that should be made is the one that the applicant is requesting. He went on to explain that if the Board agrees with Staff, then the motion should be to include the 25' and 35' palm trees that staff is requesting.

Boardmember Freeman made a motion to approve BA14-049, accept on #9, to change to (2) 25' fan palms within a landscape planter, but the motion was not seconded, and failed.

Motion: It was moved by Boardmember Siebers seconded by Boardmember Freeman to approve case BA14-049 with the following conditions:

1. *Compliance with the site plans and elevations dated April 29, 2014, except as modified by the following conditions below.*
2. *The wireless communication facility shall utilize a monopalm design with a maximum height of fifty-five feet (55') to the top of the palm canopy and 46' forty-six feet to the RAD center of the antenna array.*
3. *Palm tree trunk to have bark cladding material to resemble the bark of a date palm.*
4. *The antenna array stand-off shall not exceed 24" maximum from the pole.*
5. *The antennas shall not exceed 2' wide x 9" deep x 8' tall and 1'4" wide x 10" deep x 6'6" tall with two of each size per sector.*
6. *All antennas, mounting hardware, and other equipment near the antennas shall be painted to match the color of the faux palm fronds.*
7. *The 16.5' x 42' lease area containing the equipment shelter and generator shall be screened by a 9' tall masonry wall with solid metal gate.*
8. *Provide and maintain two natural living Washingtonia Robusta (minimum 35' and 25' high) – Mexican Fan Palms within the landscape planter surrounding the equipment enclosure (within 20' of the enclosure) to help camouflage the proposed wireless communication facility.*
9. *The operator of the monopalm shall respond to and complete all identified maintenance and repair of the facility within 30-days of receiving written notice of the problem.*
10. *Provide a permanent, weather-proof identification sign, approximately 16-inches by 32-inches in size on the gate of the fence identifying the facility operator(s), operator's address, and 24-hour telephone number for reaching the operator or an agent authorized to provide 24/7 response to emergency situations.*
11. *Maintenance of the facility shall conform to the requirements of Zoning Ordinance Section 11-35-5.I.*

**Board of Adjustment Meeting
October 1, 2014**

12. *No later than 90 days from the date the use is discontinued or the cessation of operations, the owner of the abandoned tower or the owner of the property on which the facilities are sited shall remove all equipment and improvements associated with the use and shall restore the site to its original condition as shown on the plans submitted with the original approved application. The owner or his agent shall provide written verification of the removal of the wireless communications facility within 30 days of the date the removal is completed.*
13. *Compliance with all requirements of the Development Services Division with regard to the issuance of building permits.*

FINDINGS:

1. The requested Special Use Permit (SUP) would allow the placement of 55-foot high monopalm adjacent to the east property line of the existing retail development. The mono-palm and associated ground-mounted equipment including emergency generator would be located within a 16.5' x 42' screened area. The applicant has proposed to surround the shelter and generator with an 8' tall CMU wall.
2. The wireless communication facility has been proposed to address "both capacity deficiencies and a gap in coverage." Approval of a SUP for this monopalm requires finding that the wireless communication facility is compatible with and not detrimental to surrounding properties and is consistent with the General Plan and other recognized plans and policies approved by the City Council.
3. Wireless communication facilities that exceed the maximum height permitted, are an allowed use in the LI Zoning District subject to granting of a Special Use Permit. In addition, the Zoning Ordinance includes location, design, and operation requirements.
4. Location Preferences: The Zoning Ordinance provides a ranked listing of preferred locations for new wireless communication facilities. Top preference is given to placement on existing non-residential structures, such as buildings or utility facilities located more than 300 feet from residential zones; followed by co-location on existing wireless communication facilities. When such locations are not available, locations within industrial zones are preferred, followed by stealth applications in commercial zones, then stealth applications in residential zones. The applicant evaluated existing verticality within the search radius, and has determined that there are no structures that can be used to address the specific coverage gap. Staff completed an informal review of verticality, and concurs with the applicant's assessment.
5. Design Preferences: The Zoning Ordinance provides a ranked listing of preferred design approaches for new wireless communication facilities. Top preference is given architecturally integrated building mounted antennas, such as steeples, chimneys, and cupolas, followed by building mounted antennas concealed by faux-structures, then antennas directly mounted to building and visible, but artistically integrated into the structure. When building mounted locations are not available, freestanding structure designs such as sculptures and clock towers are preferred, followed by freestanding stealth trees, then freestanding monopoles. The applicant has requested the use of a freestanding monopalm with a height of 46' feet to the RAD center of the antennas (55-feet to top of palm fronds). A monopalm design was chosen by the applicant as the best method to blend into the surrounding environment, noting the real palms existing within the adjacent retail center across June Street. However, there are not palm trees within the retail center on this side of June Street; therefore, there is a condition of approval that two natural living palms be provided and maintained close to the equipment enclosure (within 20' of the enclosure) to help camouflage the proposed wireless communication facility.
6. Location of Facilities: The Zoning Ordinance requires that within commercial districts, new freestanding antenna structures may be located within 1,000 feet of another freestanding facility, provided a stealth camouflaged design is used. As noted above, the applicant has proposed a monopalm design and stated the existing 60-foot tall monopalm located 80-feet from the proposed monopalm on the site is not co-locatable without affecting the stealth design. In addition, the existing towers within a two-mile

**Board of Adjustment Meeting
October 1, 2014**

radius are not viable as they do not meet the coverage objective or does not provide the needed coverage within Verizon's search ring.

7. *Height of Facilities:* Consistent with the Zoning Ordinance requirements, ground-mounted equipment will be screened by an eight-foot high CMU wall painted to match surrounding development. The applicant's request proposes an 8' tall CMU wall to surround the equipment shelter and emergency generator.
8. *Required Separation and Setbacks:* Alternative antenna structures, such as a monopalm, must be setback from residential uses a distance equal to the height of the structure plus one foot and setback from streets a distance equal to the height of the structure plus one foot. The proposed wireless communication facility is located 40-feet from East June Street, and is located more than 260 feet from the nearest residential property, which is located across East June Street.
9. *Design Standards:* The Zoning Ordinance provides several standards to help ensure antennas, antenna support structures, and related equipment are located, designed, and screened to blend with the existing natural or built surroundings. Specific to the use of a monopalm design, these standards help ensure that faux-trees actually camouflage the wireless facility by requiring that antennas and antenna support structures not extend beyond the outside edge of the faux-palm fronds. Concerns were raised that the three-sector, three antennas per sector antenna array will not be sufficiently camouflaged by the faux-palm fronds as each sector will have an overall width of 9' wide and will be over 30" from the pole. Therefore, there is a condition of approval to increase the length of the palm fronds to 11' and a maximum standoff of 24" to ensure the palm fronds adequately screen the antennas.

Vote: Passed (4-0) (Excused-Boardmembers Hitchens and Swanson)

**Board of Adjustment Meeting
October 1, 2014**

Case No.: BA14-050

Location: 1330 North 40th Street

Subject: Requesting a Variance to allow a residential addition to exceed the maximum height allowed in the RS-35 PAD zoning district. (PLN2014-00455)

Decision: Withdrawn

Summary: This item was on the consent agenda and was not discussed on an individual basis.

Motion: It was moved by Boardmember Siebers seconded by Boardmember Stradling to withdraw case BA14-050

Vote: Passed (4-0) (Excused-Boardmembers Hitchens and Swanson)

**Board of Adjustment Meeting
October 1, 2014**

Case No.: BA14-051

Location: 1018 South Meridian Road

Subject: 1) Requesting a Special Use Permit to allow a club/lodge; and 2) Requesting a Substantial Conformance Improvement Permit (SCIP) to allow the expansion of an existing club/lodge, both in the RM-4 zoning district. (PLN2014-00456)

Decision: Approval with Conditions

Summary: This item was on the consent agenda and was not discussed on an individual basis.

Motion: It was moved by Boardmember Siebers seconded by Boardmember Stradling to approve case BA14-051 with conditions:

1. *Compliance with the site plans and elevations submitted, except as modified by the following conditions below.*
2. *Provide 2 trees and 10 shrubs on the north side of the northernmost building on the site.*
3. *Compliance with all requirements of Design Review Administrative Approval.*
4. *Compliance with all requirements of Development Services in the issuance of building permits.*

FINDINGS:

1. This request is for a SUP and a SCIP to accommodate the expansion of an existing American Legion Post, which is classified in the Zoning Ordinance as a Club or Lodge, in the RM-4 district. The applicant is proposing to construct a 1,760 square-foot patio addition, which will be utilized as an outdoor gathering space. The patio is proposed on the north side of the southernmost building and is located between two existing structures.
2. The site is located about a quarter mile north of Southern Avenue on the west side of Meridian Road. There are two entrances from Meridian with parking provided on all four sides of the buildings.
3. The existing development complies with all of the building setback standards, however the landscape areas adjacent to the RS-6 developments to the west and south are not as wide as code currently requires, which is 20-feet. Compliance with these setbacks would remove necessary parking spaces and drive aisles for the existing development. The deviations along the east and west property lines are 10-feet, providing a 10-foot setback to the parking spaces/drive aisles. The existing setbacks were in compliance with code when the building was constructed in 14 years ago.
4. Landscaping on the perimeter of the site is existing and fully mature. The number of plant materials is in conformance with the current standards for the number of trees and shrubs required. The applicant has only proposed to add landscape plant material to the area north of their northernmost building, which is a large undeveloped blank space. They have proposed 2 additional trees be planted in that area with decorative rock. Conditions of approval include a minimum of 10 shrubs be added to that area so that it looks as though it is part of the overall landscape theme.
5. Current code requires that there is one landscape island with 1 tree and 3 shrubs for every 8 parking spaces within the development. The applicant has proposed that they leave the existing parking in its current configuration with no additional landscape islands. The addition of the landscape islands would eliminate necessary parking spaces for the development.
6. Full compliance with current Code development standards would require significant demolition of existing improvements.
7. The proposed Special Use Permit is being requested to allow the expansion of the existing Club or Lodge in the RM-4 zoning district. The American Legion has shown itself to operate in a manner

**Board of Adjustment Meeting
October 1, 2014**

compatible with adjacent residential areas.

8. The proposed expansion to the American Legion Post is compatible with adjacent developments, as it is on the interior of the site, between existing buildings, and its purpose is to serve existing members of the club/lodge. Therefore, the proposed expansion will be compatible with, and not detrimental to, surrounding properties.

Vote: Passed (4-0) (Excused-Boardmembers Hitchens and Swanson)

**Board of Adjustment Meeting
October 1, 2014**

Case No.: BA14-052

Location: 1868 North Power Road

Subject: Requesting a Special Use Permit to allow a wireless communications facility to exceed the maximum height allowed in the LC zoning district. (PLN2014-00461)

Decision: Approval with Conditions

Summary: The applicant, Randy Downing represented Coal Creek Consulting at 1525 N. Hayden Road Suite #100, Scottsdale, 85257 on behalf of Verizon Wireless presented his case to the Board. He explained that a capacity gap exists in the area, and an existing local site cannot be upgraded anymore, therefore a new monopalm is needed.

Alan Tom, owner of the commercial property adjacent to the proposed site was concerned that the proposed cell tower is too close to his property. He felt that the cell tower would affect his site's marketability, and that the new tower would create an eyesore in the area. He was also concerned about the emergency diesel generator creating a noise issue, and the regularly scheduled maintenance of the cell tower equipment creating a nuisance to the neighborhood. He felt that it is a civic duty of the Verizon Corporation to try to locate the cell tower in a way that would reduce the visual impact of the structure because the current site is so prominent in relation to the intersection. He then requested the Board to continue the case to give Verizon more ample time to find a more suitable location for the cell tower.

The applicant explained to Boardmember Freeman that he did not live in the area, but he was concerned about the marketability of his commercial property.

Mr. Downing explained that when sites are selected, they are chosen based on engineers' recommendations to try and best remedy service and coverage issues. He informed the Board that older sites used to be only necessary for voice call, but now there are heavier demands due to increased data requirements, and that the effective coverage area is a lot smaller. He explained that the site was chosen to be most acceptable to the Ordinance and that all requirements were met. He mentioned that the generator on site is not a primary generator, but an emergency generator, which would not be ran at night unless it was an emergency situation.

Mr. Downing reported that in regards to neighborhood outreach, one neighbor was concerned, but was met with, and he felt that all his concerns were addressed. The applicant also added that he is willing to work with staff to develop an attenuation plan to further mitigate noise. In conclusion, he feels that the parcel is the most appropriate site for the tower, and it will ensure quality service for cell phone users in the area.

The applicant explained to the Board that he had not met with Economic Development to determine locational viability specifically, but he explained that other sites were evaluated, and this particular site was chosen by Verizon to best meet coverage goals. The applicant finished by sharing the projected service ring map that the proposed cell tower would

Board of Adjustment Meeting

October 1, 2014

provide with the Board.

Motion: It was moved by Boardmember Freeman seconded by Boardmember Stradling to approve case BA14-052 with the following conditions:

1. *Compliance with the site plans and elevations submitted July 23, 2014 and dated April 29, 2014, except as modified by the following conditions below.*
2. *The wireless communication facility shall utilize a MonoElm design with a maximum height of sixty-five feet (65') to the top of the branch/leaf canopy and 55' fifty-five feet to the RAD center of the antenna array.*
3. *The stealth design of the wireless communication facility shall conform to these standards:*
 - a. *Provide (3) branches per linear foot of tree height.*
 - b. *Provide curved antenna branches to better conceal antenna panels.*
 - c. *Paint all mounting hardware and other equipment to blend with the leaves / branches.*
 - d. *Provide bark color and texture along the entire length of the pole(s) to match the bark of a natural elm tree. This shall include multiple colors to better simulate bark of a tree.*
 - e. *Antenna socks with leaves and branches to match the broadleaf tree foliage.*
 - f. *The faux elm branches shall start at 15' from the ground level. (This height may be adjusted depending on the overall tree height to ensure it is proportional.)*
 - g. *The faux elm branch density shall not be reduced near the antenna arrays.*
 - h. *The faux branches shall extend past the antennas a minimum of 12". The form of the tree canopy shall be widened to a more natural form as evidenced in the photos of Appendix "B".*
4. *The antenna array shall conform to the dimensions and configuration established in details 2/Z-2 and 4/Z-2*
5. ***Provide screening for the ground-mounted equipment as follows:***
 - a. ***Construct a masonry wall to enclose the 19' X 45' lease area to a height equal to the height of the equipment being screened, with solid metal gate. Masonry wall and gate are to be painted to blend with adjacent walls and architecture, or***
 - b. ***Construct a building to enclose the equipment. The building shall meet Mesa's Design Guidelines and shall be compatible with the surrounding development.***
6. *A minimum of (11), (5) –gallon-size shrubs shall be planted within this landscape planter surrounding the enclosure.*
7. ***Provide and maintain two natural living elm trees (minimum 36" box) - within the landscape area of the site surrounding the equipment enclosure to help camouflage the proposed wireless communication facility.***
8. *The operator of the MonoElm shall respond to and complete all identified maintenance and repair of the facility within 30-days of receiving written notice of the problem.*
9. *Provide a permanent, weather-proof identification sign, approximately 16-inches by 32-inches in size on the gate of the fence identifying the facility operator(s), operator's address, and 24-hour telephone number for reaching the operator or an agent authorized to provide 24/7 response to emergency situations.*
10. *Maintenance of the facility shall conform to the requirements of Zoning Ordinance Section 11-35-5.I.*
11. *No later than 90 days from the date the use is discontinued or the cessation of operations, the owner of the abandoned tower or the owner of the property on which the facilities are sited shall remove all equipment and improvements associated with the use and shall restore the site to its original condition as shown on the plans submitted with the original approved application. The owner or his agent shall provide written verification of the removal of the wireless communications facility within 30 days of the date the removal is completed.*

Board of Adjustment Meeting

October 1, 2014

12. *Compliance with all requirements of the Development Services Division with regard to the issuance of building permits.*

FINDINGS:

1. Evaluation of existing facilities has determined that there are no structures that can be used to address this specific coverage gap.
2. The faux tree design of this WCF meets Ordinance §11-35-5 design preference #6 for stealth design.
3. The WCF is 65 feet tall. The required separation from residential uses is height + one foot. The actual separation is 150 feet.
4. This new facility will advance the goals and objectives of the City of Mesa.
5. The location, size, design, and operating characteristics of this WCF are consistent with the purposes of the LC district.
6. The proposed WCF will not be injurious or detrimental to the adjacent or surrounding properties.
7. Adequate public services, facilities and infrastructure are available to serve this project.

Vote: Passed (4-0) (Excused-Boardmembers Hitchens and Swanson)

**Board of Adjustment Meeting
October 1, 2014**

Case No.: BA14-053

Location: 2110 & 2120 West Southern Avenue

Subject: Requesting a modification to a Substantial Conformance Improvement Permit to allow the redevelopment of an existing group commercial center in the LC zoning district. (PLN2014-00470)

Decision: Continuance to the November 5, 2014 hearing

Summary: This item was on the consent agenda and was not discussed on an individual basis.

Motion: It was moved by Boardmember Siebers seconded by Boardmember Stradling to continue case BA14-053 to the November 5, 2014 hearing

Vote: Passed (4-0) (Excused-Boardmembers Hitchens and Swanson)

**Board of Adjustment Meeting
October 1, 2014**

OTHER BUSINESS:

None

ITEMS FROM CITIZENS PRESENT

None

Respectfully submitted,

Gordon Sheffield, AICP CNU-a
Zoning Administrator